

**PATENT**

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**  
(sparta01.019)

<b>Applicant:</b>	Flam, et al.	<b>Confirmation No:</b> 4594
<b>Application No:</b>	10/715,278	<b>Group Art Unit:</b> 2115
<b>Filed:</b>	11/17/03	<b>Examiner:</b> Cribbs, Malcolm D.

**Title:** *Techniques for reconfiguring configurable systems*

---

Commissioner for Patents  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**Response to a non-final Office action under 37 C.F.R. 1.111**

**Summary of the prosecution**

The application was filed with claims 1-26. Of these claims, claims 1, 19, and 26 are independent claims. Examiner mailed a first Office action in this application on 3/30/2006. In the Office action, claims 12,4,7-9, 11 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over the combination of Applicants' admitted prior art (henceforth AAPA) and U.S. Patent 7,000,229, Gere, *Method and system for live operating environment upgrades*, filed Jul. 24, 3002 (henceforth "Gere"); claims 2,3,5,6,10, 12-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C., 103(a) as obvious over the combination of AAPA, Gere, and U.S. Patent 6,792,556, Dennis, *Boot Record Recovery*, filed May 31, 2000 (henceforth Dennis).

On June 27, Applicants' attorney requested an interview in the above application, which Examiner graciously granted on Thursday, June 29 at 1:00 PM. A draft of a response traversing the rejections was faxed to Examiner in advance of the interview and formed the basis of the discussion at the interview. No agreement was reached at the interview, but Examiner requested that a response incorporating the draft be filed. Applicants did this and Examiner mailed a second non-final Office action on 7/26/2006.

In the second non-final Office action, Examiner rejected all claims under 35 U.S.C. 103. Claims 1, 4, 7-18 were rejected on the basis of the combination of the AAPA with a new reference, U.S. published patent application 2004/0015508, Anonsen, *Object-level conflict detection in an object-relational database system*, filed 7/22/2002. Claims 2-3, 5, 6 were rejected on the basis of the combination of AAPA with Anonsen and Dennis. Claims 19-26 were rejected on the same basis. In the following, Applicants are amending claims 2 and 5 to prevent any misunderstanding of the meaning of the term "snapshot" as used in the claims and are traversing the rejections.

**Please amend the claims as follows:**